

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/730,700	RAFELD, KARL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Son T. Nguyen	3643	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Son T. Nguyen. (3)_____.

(2) Tom Anderson. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 17 August 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 13.

Identification of prior art discussed: Cattaneo (3952807).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Anderson submits proposed language of "said flat plate extending into an area between said separated portions". The Examiner believes it still reads on the prior art of Cattaneo. The Examiner suggested, but not limiting to, language indicating a gap or space with no material in between the separated portions. In addition, the Examiner suggested that Mr. Anderson amend the specification to reflect this added language and to include critical reason as to the functionality of the gap or space.